UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,235	04/29/2005	Masaya Nishio	271564US0PCT	5068
22850 7590 12/15/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			WESTERBERG, NISSA M	
ALEAANDRIA	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Notice of About a const	10/533,235	NISHIO, MASA`	ΥA
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nissa M. Westerberg	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app			dress
This application is abandoned in view of:			
Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of M period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on	failing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on	<u></u> .	•
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o	nendment which pla	aces the
(c) A reply was received on but it does not constitutional rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See 6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	mpt at a proper rep	ly, to the non-
(d) ⊠ No reply has been received.			
 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8: (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was	5). received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Tr	ansmission dated
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance	e of \$ is due.		
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$	The publication fee, if required by 37	CFR 1.18(d), is \$	•
(c) \square The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has no	ot been received.		
 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requal Allowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on 			
after the expiration of the period for reply.	•		
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.			
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. 	e attorney or agent of record, the assi	ignee of the entire i	nterest, or all of
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.	attorney or agent (acting in a repres	entative capacity ur	nder 37 CFR
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim		e the period for see	eking court review
7. ☐ The reason(s) below:			
The lack of response was confirmed by Judy Moore	on December 7, 2010		
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618	/Nissa M Westerberg/ Examiner, Art Unit 1618		
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (CFR 1.181, should be	promptly filed to